

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application, as amended.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the telephonic interview conducted on September 2, 2009. Without necessarily acceding to the Office's characterization of the teachings of Chamoff as set forth in the Interview Summary of September 4, 2009, Applicants respectfully submit that the substance of the interview is otherwise accurately reflected therein as well as in the present Amendment.

By this Amendment, Claim 9 has been amended to more particularly recite subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention, as discussed in detail below. Claims 10, 11, and 14 have also been amended for clarity. Claims 12, 14, 18, and 20 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to reduce the issues. Claims 1-7 were previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and Claims 8 and 21 currently stand as withdrawn from consideration as being directed to non-elected inventions.

Thus, Claims 9-11, 13, 15-17, and 19 are active pending.

In the Office Action, Claims 9-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Chamoff in combination with Sugiyama; and Claims 15-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Chamoff and Sugiyama in further combination with Fukunaga.

Without acceding to the rejections, Claim 9 now recites, *inter alia*:

that the first data block includes an operation control block and a corresponding operation data block each associated with said operation;

transmitting, by the satellite system, the operation control block to a control portion of a peripheral coupler of the satellite system;

transmitting, by the satellite system, the operation data block to a data portion of the peripheral coupler of the satellite system,

that the operation control block and said operation data blocks are used by said satellite system to execute said operation using a peripheral subsystem operably coupled to the satellite system via the peripheral coupler;

that a first step is performed using a first directional link, and that a second step is performed using a second directional link having a direction different from said first directional link,

in which the satellite system is master for the first and second directional links, the first directional link is an uplink from the satellite system to the central system, and the second directional link is a downlink from the central system to the satellite system.

Support is provided, for example, at paragraphs [00120, [0093], and [0096]; and FIGS. 1 and 5 of Applicants' English-language specification. It is apparent that the applied references do not teach or suggest this combination of features.

For example, primary reference Chamoff is directed to a reconfigurable cluster of data-entry terminals. *See* Chamoff, Abstract. Accordingly, Chamoff is not seen as teaching or suggesting transmitting, by the satellite system, an operation control block to a control portion of a peripheral coupler of the satellite system, such that the operation control block and said operation data blocks are used by said satellite system to execute said operation using a peripheral subsystem operably coupled to the satellite system via the peripheral coupler, as recited in Claim 9.

Moreover, Chamoff is also not seen as teaching or suggesting that a first step is performed using a first directional link, and that a second step is performed using a second directional link having a direction different from said first directional link, and

that the satellite system is master for the first and second directional links, the first directional link is an uplink from the satellite system to the central system, and the second directional link is a downlink from the central system to the satellite system, as recited in Claim 9.

For example, Chamoff teaches a cluster of data entry terminals including satellite terminals and media terminals. *See* Chamoff, FIGS. 5 and 6. Chamoff teaches that his media terminal – not the satellite terminal – can be designated as a “primary” terminal that “controls data flow on the link and storage in its own central storage.” Chamoff, col. 2, lines 24-28; col. 19, lines 32-58; and FIG. 21. Chamoff’s media terminals are reconfigurably clustered such that a designated “backup” media terminal can take over the duties of a “primary” media terminal if the primary terminal malfunctions. *See* Chamoff, col. 2, line 15 to col. 3, line 8; col. 6, lines 38-46. Chamoff also discusses prior art systems in which one terminal is designated a master terminal and “data from the remaining terminals is applied through the master terminal for recording on the magnetic cassette.” Chamoff, col. 1, lines 27-37.

However, Chamoff is not seen as teaching or suggesting that any of his satellite terminals can serve as a master terminal.

The secondary references are not seen as remedying the above-noted deficiencies of Chamoff. For example, secondary reference Sugiyama is directed to a point-of-sale system that uses a backup file and a master file. *See* Sugiyama, Abstract. Sugiyama is understood as teaching that the backup file and the master file are updated to maintain point-of-sale information using, among other things, a file control section (14).

Sugiyama, col. 4, lines 50-68; and FIGS. 1 and 2. Further, Sugiyama teaches a master

terminal 24 that is distinct from a plurality of satellite terminals 30. *See* Sugiyama, FIG.

1.

In addition, Fukunaga is directed to an information processing apparatus and storage medium. *See* Fukunaga, Abstract. Accordingly, Fukunaga is not understood as teaching or suggesting a satellite system at all.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 9 distinguishes patentably from the applied references.

Dependent Claims 10, 11, 13, 15-17, and 19 are also believed to be patentable due at least to their dependence from Claim 9 as well as for the additional subject matter recited in Claims 10, 11, 13, 15-17, and 19.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request a prompt Notice of Allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 (T2147-907751) any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this paper and has not been separately requested, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 2, 2009

Miles & Stockbridge, P.C.
1751 Pinnacle Drive Suite 500
McLean, Virginia 22102-3833
Telephone: (703) 610-8647

By: 

Eric G. King
Reg. No. 42,736